

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE J		PAGE OF PAGES 1 24	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0003		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 19-Apr-2016		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. STEPPR16R0001		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY/J4C 8725 JOHN J. KINGMAN ROAD, MSC 6201 FORT BELVOIR VA 22060-6201		CODE HDTRA1		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) See Item 6		CODE	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)				X		9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. HDTRA1-16-R-0001	
				X		9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 03-Mar-2016	
						10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
						10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE		FACILITY CODE					
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning 3 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.							
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)							
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.							
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.							
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).							
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:							
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)							
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.							
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) The purpose of this Amendment is to reopen proposal preparation period until 12:00 noon, April 22, 2016 for the purpose of making a minor correction to Sections L and M. No other changes have been made.							
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.							
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)				16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)			
				TEL: EMAIL:			
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		15C. DATE SIGNED		16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		16C. DATE SIGNED 19-Apr-2016	

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

SECTION L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS AND NOTICES TO BIDDERS

The following have been modified:

INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFEROR

SECTION L

INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS OR RESPONDENTS

This is a commercial procurement utilizing FAR parts 12 Acquisition of Commercial Items and 15 Contracting by Negotiation.

FAR 52.252-1	Solicitation Provisions Incorporated by Reference	FEB 1998
--------------	---	----------

This solicitation incorporates one or more solicitation provisions by reference, with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request, the Contracting Officer will make their full text available. The Offeror is cautioned that the listed provisions may include blocks that must be completed by the Offeror and submitted with its quotation or offer. In lieu of submitting the full text of those provisions, the Offeror may identify the provision by paragraph identifier and provide the appropriate information with its quotation or offer. Also, the full text of a solicitation provision may be accessed electronically at this address: <http://farsite.hill.af.mil>

FAR 52.215-1	Instructions to Offerors – Competitive Acquisition	JAN 2004
FAR 52.215-16	Facilities Capital Cost of Money	JUN 2003
FAR 52.222-24	Pre-award On-Site Equal Opportunity Compliance	FEB 1999
	Evaluation	
FAR 52.237-10	Identification of Uncompensated Overtime	OCT 1997
FAR 52.216-1	Type of Contract	APR 1984

The Government contemplates award of a single award Time & Materials ‘C’ type contract.

FAR 52.233-2	Service of Protest	SEP 2006
--------------	--------------------	----------

(a) Protests, as defined in section 33.101 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that are filed directly with an agency, and copies of any protests that are filed with the Government Accountability Office (GAO), shall be served on the Contracting Officer (addressed as follows) by obtaining written and dated acknowledgement of receipt from:

(b) The copy of any protest shall be received in the office designated above within one day of filing a protest with the GAO.

DTRA Clause 252.204-9000	Notice to Potential Offerors – Official DTRA Addresses in the National Capital Region (NCR)	DEC 2007
--------------------------	--	----------

1. Offerors are responsible for submitting proposals and any proposal modifications/revisions to the designated office by the date and time specified in the solicitation. For the purposes of this clause, the “designated office” is the office appearing in the attention line of the mailing addresses in paragraph 2 below. Proposals received after this exact time will NOT be considered unless it meets one of the exceptions stated in Federal Acquisitions Regulation (FAR)52.215-1(c)(3).

2. DTRA has two official mailing addresses in the NCR. Due to heightened security measures, hand-carried proposals cannot be accepted; therefore, Offerors are to select one address below based on the method of mailing.

a. The official United States Postal Service (USPS) mailing address for DTRA:

Defense Threat Reduction Agency
Attn: DTRA Contracts/Leslie Simpson
8725 John J. Kingman Rd. Stop 6201
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6201

b. DTRA cannot accept packages delivered via commercial express and ground carrier to any address other than the one listed below. For all incoming packages to DTRA activities in the Washington DC area (this includes packages sent via Federal Express, DHL, Airborne, UPS and other commercial carriers), use the following address:

Defense Threat Reduction Agency
Attn: DTRA Contracts/Leslie Simpson
6200 Meade Road
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5264

Note: This address shall also be used in all contracts for delivery of supplies/materials.

3. If mailing via USPS, Offerors are cautioned to allow 2 days for processing and delivery of all proposal information to the designated office **after** it has been received at the DTRA mailroom. This mail processing delay is unavoidable, so Offerors are encouraged to carefully select the mailing method to ensure timely receipt of proposals.

L.1.0 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

L.1.1 GENERAL INFORMATION

L.1.1.1 Point of Contact

The Contract Specialist (CS) is the primary point of contact for this acquisition.

The CS for this acquisition is:

Chad Roney
Defense Threat Reduction Agency
J4/J8C - ACQUISITION/FINANCE/LOGISTICS DIR
Phone: (703) 767-7969
Email address: chad.m.roney.civ@mail.mil

The Contracting Officer (CO) for this acquisition is:

Leslie Simpson
Defense Threat Reduction Agency
J4/J8C - ACQUISITION/FINANCE/LOGISTICS DIR
Phone #: (703) 767-3503
Email: leslie.f.simpson.civ@mail.mil

Offerors are instructed to submit questions or concerns regarding this solicitation via email to dtra.belvoir.J3-7.room.step@mail.mil with the subject line "Questions Concerning HDTRA1-16-R-0001." **Questions are due by 8:00AM EST on March 8, 2016.** DTRA reserves the right to not provide written responses to any or all questions/concerns, however, major issues that are brought to DTRA's attention will be addressed; likely via an Amendment to the solicitation. While DTRA appreciates any feedback, we are looking for major questions or concerns.

Proposals in response to the RFP shall be delivered in accordance with the mailing instructions in DTRA 252.204-9000 no later than 12:00PM Eastern on April 14, 2016. All proposals received after the exact time specified for receipt shall be treated as a late submission and will not be considered. The Government will not return any proposals to the Offeror and will destroy extra copies of proposal once they are no longer needed.

Change pages in response to Amendment 3 of the RFP shall be delivered electronically via email to dtra.belvoir.J3-7.room.step@mail.mil no later than 12:00PM Eastern on April 22, 2016. All change pages received after the exact time specified for receipt shall be treated as a late submission and will not be considered. The Government will not return any change pages to the Offeror and will destroy extra copies once they are no longer needed.

L.1.1.2 Debriefings

L.1.1.2.1 Preaward Debriefings

Offerors excluded from the competitive range or otherwise excluded from the competition before award may request a debriefing. Offerors may request a pre-award debriefing by submitting a written request to the CO for debriefing within three (3) calendar days after receipt of the notice of exclusion from the competition. The Government shall make every effort to debrief unsuccessful Offerors as soon as practicable.

L.1.1.2.2 Post-award Debriefings

Offerors may request a debriefing by providing a written request to the CO. The CO will notify Offerors of the source selection decision within three (3) calendar days after award. Offerors that desire a debriefing must request one in writing within three (3) calendar days after receipt of the CO notification. To the maximum extent practicable, debriefings will be conducted within five (5) calendar days after the Offeror's request.

L.1.1.3 Discrepancies

If an Offeror believes that the requirements in these instructions contain errors, omissions, or are otherwise unsound, the Offeror shall immediately notify the CO in writing with supporting rationale. The Offeror is reminded that the Government reserves the right to award this effort based on the initial proposal, as received, without discussion. If, during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, the discussions will be held with only those Offerors determined to be in the competitive range.

L.1.2 ORGANIZATION/DISTRIBUTION/NUMBER OF COPIES/PAGE LIMITS

The Offeror shall prepare the proposal as set forth in the Proposal Organization Table 1-2 below. The titles and contents of the volumes, as well as the page limitations and number of required copies shall be as specified in the table. In the event that the table conflicts with the detailed instructions in the paragraphs that follow, the detailed instructions shall take precedence.

Table 1-2 – Proposal Organization

VOLUME	VOLUME TITLE	PAGE LIMIT
I 3 copies	PROPOSAL DOCUMENTATION	Unlimited
II 7 copies	MISSION CAPABILITY	
	Management Approach	15
	Resumes for Key Personnel	6
	Technical Approach	24
	Resumes for Technical Solutions	10 per Sample TD

III 4 copies	PAST PERFORMANCE	
	Description of Team	10
	Present and Past Performance References	5 pages per reference
	Organizational Change History	Unlimited
IV 4 copies	COST	Unlimited

a. The “ORIGINAL” copy of Volumes I, II, III, and IV of the proposal shall be provided under separate cover, and shall be clearly marked “ORIGINAL.” The “original” paper copy shall have no staples and no holes punched in it. The “ORIGINAL” copy is included in the copy count above.

b. As shown in Table 1-2, additional paper copies of Volumes I, II, III, and IV shall be submitted in separate 3-ring loose-leaf binders, which when open, lay flat. No staples shall be used. A cover sheet shall be posted at the beginning of each volume, clearly marked as to volume number, title, copy number, RFP identification, and the Offeror’s name. The same identifying data shall be placed on the spine of each binder.

c. **All proposal volumes shall be provided by mail or commercial express or ground carrier only as prescribed in above DTRA Clause 252.204-9000, “Notice to Potential Offerors – Official DTRA Addresses in the National Capital Region (NCR),” DEC 2007 (the clause is at the beginning of Section L). Present and Past Performance Questionnaires L-2 shall be e-mailed in PDF format to the contract specialist and contracting officer’s e-mail addresses shown in Paragraph L.1.1.**

PLEASE NOTE THE REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS ARE CONTAINED IN FAR 52.215-1.

L.1.3 PROPOSAL FORMAT

L.1.3.1 Guidance

This section of the Information to Offerors (ITO) provides general guidance for preparing proposals as well as specific instructions on the format and content of the proposal. The Offeror’s proposal must include all data and information requested by the ITO and must be submitted in accordance with these instructions. Non-compliance with the instructions provided in the ITO may result in an unfavorable proposal evaluation.

L.1.3.2 Sufficient Detail

Proposals shall comply with the following guidelines:

- Be complete and respond directly to the requirements of the solicitation.
- Address the factors, sub-factors, and their related elements as listed in Section M of the solicitation.
- Be clear, concise, and include sufficient detail for effective evaluation and for substantiating the validity of stated assertions. Extraneous, repetitious, or wordy submissions are not desired and could result in lower ratings.
- Do not simply rephrase or restate the Government’s requirements, but rather provide convincing rationale to address how the Offeror intends to meet the requirements.
- Assume that the Government has no prior knowledge of the Offeror’s capabilities and experience, and will base its evaluation only on the information presented in the Offeror’s proposal.

L.1.3.3 Validity Statement

The Offeror is requested to complete the proposal validity date in block 12, Section A of the solicitation, with not less than 180 days. In addition, the Offeror shall make a clear statement that the proposal is valid for the duration of the acceptance period. This statement shall be included in Volume I. In accordance with FAR Subpart 4.8

(Government Contract Files), the Government will retain one copy of all unsuccessful proposals. Unless the Offeror requests otherwise, the Government will destroy extra copies of unsuccessful proposals.

L.1.3.4 Physical Appearance of Submissions

- Elaborate brochures or documentation, detailed artwork, or other embellishments are unnecessary and are not desired.
- Proposals will be submitted in paper and electronic copies.
- Paper copies of the proposal must lie flat when open. Elaborate binding is not desired.
- No models, mockups, or videotapes will be accepted.

L.1.3.5 Page Format Restrictions and Limitations

L.1.3.5.1 Page Size

Pages shall be 8.5 x 11 inches, not including foldouts. Format the pages in Offeror preferred format (either one column or two columns). Except for the lettering that is within a graphic, the font size shall be no less than 10 point. Lettering within tables, charts, graphs, and figures shall be no smaller than 8 point. Margins on all four edges of each sheet will be at least one-inch. Proprietary statements, security markings, and page numbers may be placed within the defined margin area. Pages shall be numbered sequentially by volume. In the event discussions are held, these page format restrictions shall also apply to responses to Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs).

L.1.3.5.2 Page Limitations

Page limitations shall be treated as maximums. If exceeded, the excess pages will not be read or considered in the evaluation of the proposal. Printed material shall be on one side of the sheet only (single-sided). In the event discussions are held, page limitations may be placed on responses to ENs. Page limits, if specified for EN responses, will be identified in the letters forwarding the ENs to the Offerors.

L.1.3.5.3 Pages Counted

Each page shall be counted except the following:

- Past performance questionnaires
- Past performance questionnaire point of contact list
- Cover pages
- RFP cross-reference matrix
- Teaming arrangements
- Past performance consent letters
- Client authorization letters
- Tables of contents
- Revision matrix
- Small business subcontracting plan
- Scenario task SOW
- Glossaries
- Lists of figures, tables, or drawings
- Tabs
- Dividers
- Blank pages

L.1.3.6 Indexing

Each volume shall contain a more detailed table of contents to delineate the sections within that volume. Tab indexing shall be used to identify sections.

L.1.3.7 Foldouts

Legible tables, charts, graphs, diagrams, schematics, and figures shall be used wherever practical to depict organizations, systems and layout, implementation schedules, design drawings, plans, etc. These displays shall be uncomplicated, legible, and shall not exceed 11 x 17 inches in size. Foldout pages shall fold entirely within the volume. Each printed side of a foldout will count as one page. Foldout pages may only be used for large tables,

charts, graphs, diagrams, and schematics; not for pages of text. For tables, charts, graphs, and figures, the font shall be no smaller than 8 point. All information (except documentation numbers, classification markings, and page numbers) shall be contained within an image area of 9 x 15-1/2 inches.

L.1.3.8 Electronic Copies

a. Electronic copies of each volume shall be submitted on individual CD-ROMs in a protective sleeve or case. Each CD-ROM and protective sleeve or case shall be clearly marked as to volume number, title, RFP identification, and the Offeror's name. The CD-ROM(s) will be included with the "original" paper copy of each volume. Offerors are responsible for ensuring electronic copies are virus-free.

b. Submit an electronic copy of each volume compatible with the following available Government equipment and software products:

- Pentium Class PCs
- Adobe Acrobat Reader 8.0
- Microsoft Office Excel 2003*

*All cost information, with the exception of the cost narrative, must lend itself to review and analysis by the Government and must be submitted in Microsoft Excel format. Offerors shall include formulas and working links to the maximum extent practicable.

Note:

The electronic copy shall be in Adobe Acrobat (except for Microsoft Excel) portable document file (pdf) searchable text format and shall be an exact duplicate of the "original" paper proposal. If there are discrepancies between the electronic proposal and the "original" paper proposal, the paper proposal shall prevail.

c. Electronic files shall be clearly identified for each volume, section, item, etc. The Offeror shall not embed sound or video (e.g., MPEG) files into the proposal files.

d. Electronic Media additional information:

- All text must be searchable
- Limit colors to 256 colors at 1280 x 1024 resolution; avoid color gradients
- Keep embedded graphics as simple as possible; large graphic files are discouraged
- Minimize the use of scanned images (except for Adobe Acrobat requirements)
- Use of self-extracting archive files (e.g., ZIP files) is allowed

L.1.3.9 Cost Information

All cost information shall be addressed ONLY in the Contract Cost Volumes, Volumes I and IV respectively. All cost information, with the exception of the cost narrative, must lend itself to review and analysis by the Government and must be submitted in Microsoft Excel format. Offerors shall include formulas and working links to the maximum extent practicable.

L.1.3.10 Volume Designation

Information required for proposal evaluation that is not found in its designated volume will be assumed to have been omitted from the proposal. Each volume shall be written on a stand-alone basis so that its contents may be evaluated without cross-referencing to other volumes of the proposal. Exceptions to the above include only teaming arrangements, letters of commitment, socio-economic commitment information and Organizational Conflicts of Interest assertions which must be submitted in Volume I but may be cross-referenced in other volumes.

L.1.3.11 Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms

Each volume shall contain a glossary of all abbreviations and acronyms used, with an explanation for each. Glossaries do not count against the page limitations for their respective volumes.

L.2.0 VOLUME I –PROPOSAL DOCUMENTATION

Volume I consists of the offer to enter into a contract to perform the desired work and information for the Government to prepare the contract document and supporting file.

L.2.1 VOLUME ORGANIZATION

The volume shall be organized according to the following outline:

- a. Table of Contents
- b. List of Tables and Drawings
- c. Glossary
- d. Documents listed in paragraphs L.2.2 through L.2.13

L.2.2 SOLICITATION/CONTRACT FORM

Completion of Blocks 12 through 16 and signature and date for Blocks 17 and 18 of the Standard Form (SF) 33 and acknowledgement of all Amendments to the solicitation, in addition to a completed Section B, CLIN structure is required. Signature by the Offeror on the SF 33 constitutes an offer, which the Government may accept.

L.2.3 AUTHORIZED OFFEROR PERSONNEL

Provide the name, title, telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address of the company and division point of contact regarding decisions made with respect to the Offeror's proposal and who can obligate the Offeror contractually. Also identify those individuals authorized to negotiate with the Government.

L.2.4 COMPANY DIVISION ADDRESS, IDENTIFYING CODES AND APPLICABLE DESIGNATIONS

Provide the company's/division's street address, county, and facility code; CAGE Code; DUNS number; Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN), size of business (large or small); and labor surplus area designation.

Note: This information is required for the prime contractor only.

L.2.5 TEAMING ARRANGEMENTS AND/OR LETTERS OF INTENT

Provide all Teaming Arrangements and/or Letters of Intent.

L.2.6 INFORMATION REQUIRED BY DFARS CLAUSE 252.227-7017 IDENTIFICATION AND ASSERTION OF USE, RELEASE, OR DISCLOSURE RESTRICTIONS (JUN 1995)

If applicable, the Offeror shall include 252.227-7017 paragraph (d) chart, in full-text, filled-in/completed.

L.2.7 EXCEPTIONS TO TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Exceptions taken to the terms and conditions of the solicitation, or to any of its formal attachments, including the sample Technical Directives, shall be identified. Each exception shall be specifically related to each paragraph and/or specific part of the solicitation to which the exception is taken. Provide rationale in support of the exception and fully explain its impact, if any, on the performance, schedule, cost, and specific requirements of the solicitation. This information shall be provided in the format and content of Table 2.9. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in the Offeror being removed from consideration for award.

Table 2.9 – Solicitation Exceptions

Solicitation Document	Paragraph/Page	Requirement/Portion	Rationale
Statement of Objectives (SOW), Solicitation Section, Attachment,	Applicable Page and Paragraph numbers	Identify the requirement or portion to which the exception is taken	Justify/explain the basis for exception and impact on contract

Sample Tasks, etc.			
--------------------	--	--	--

L.2.8 REPRESENTATIONS, CERTIFICATIONS, AND OTHER STATEMENTS OF OFFEROR(S) (SECTIONS K AND L)

The Offeror is responsible to ensure that all representations, certifications, acknowledgements, and statements provided in accordance with Sections K and L are provided in the System for Award Management (SAM) at <https://www.sam.gov/>.

The Offeror is additionally required to: 1) acknowledge compliance with DFARS Provision 252.203-7005 and 2) complete the DFARS Provision 252.209-7999. Both provisions are cited in Section K and each shall be signed and dated by an official authorized to contractually obligate the Offeror.

L.2.9 SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN

IAW FAR 19.704 and DFARS 219.704 Other than small business Offerors shall submit a small business subcontracting plan in accordance with FAR 52.219-9 and DFARS 252.219-7003.

L.2.10 SOCIO-ECONOMIC COMMITMENT

DTRA is committed to maximizing small businesses opportunities at both the prime and subcontractor level. All Offerors (large and small business) shall prepare a summary list of proposed subcontractors, which includes the following information: Company Name, CAGE Code, Size Status, Socio-Economic Status, Subcontract Dollars, and *Percentage of Total Contract Value proposed*. For Socio-Economic Commitment evaluation purposes, the *Total Contract Value proposed* is considered to be the numerical sum of the total dollar value for all work as contemplated under this solicitation. DTRA will use the SAM website data to verify proposed small business entities meet the assigned RFP NAICS (541690) small business size standard (\$15 million annual revenue). Offeror's proposals will be assessed on their commitment to meeting the subcontracting goal of **at least 25%** of the *total contract value proposed* to Small Business. Alaska Native Corporation (ANC) and Indian tribe subcontractors may be counted as part of the Small Business subcontracting percentage in accordance with FAR 19.703(c). Small business prime contractors may include the cost of work self-performed toward meeting the 25% Small Business requirement.

Figure L.2.1 illustrates the minimum Socio-Economic Commitment percentage requirement based on *total contract value proposed* for Small Business concerns.



Figure L.2.1

L.2.11 SMALL BUSINESS COMMITMENT TEMPLATE

To ensure consistency in the calculation of Small Business Commitment, a calculation template is provided as Form S-1 (Attachment 5) of the RFP. This attachment will be used by all Offerors to document the proposed Small Business participation as required in paragraph L.2.11. Attachment 5 will be compared to the Offeror's cost proposal for consistency. In the case of minor errors or omissions that do not affect the other areas of the proposal, and may be corrected with minor clarification, the Offeror may be contacted by the Contracting Officer for immediate clarification.

In the case that an Offeror meets the criteria as specified in paragraph L.2.11 and through discussions provides a Final Proposal Revision (FPR), the criteria for paragraph L.2.11 must be met and the Offeror must resubmit the SB calculation attachment.

L.2.12 PREAWARD ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

a. The Contracting Officer has determined this contract may give rise to potential conflicts of interest due in part to contractors currently providing support to DTRA, who may have access to information that could potentially provide an unfair competitive advantage. Moreover, the nature of the work required by this contract could provide the awardee access to information that could potentially provide an unfair competitive advantage for future contracts. Offerors are directed to FAR Subpart 9.5 for detailed information concerning organizational conflicts of interest.

b. Each Offeror must include in Volume I of its proposal either;

(1) a statement certifying that, to the best of its knowledge, it is not aware of any facts which create any actual or potential organizational conflicts of interest relating to the award of this contract, or

(2) a statement that describes concisely all relevant facts concerning any past, present, or planned interest (financial, contractual, organizational, or otherwise) relating to the work to be performed under the proposed contract and bearing on whether the Offeror has a possible organizational conflict of interest.

c. The Contracting Officer may require further relevant information from an Offeror and may, at his discretion, permit an Offeror to clarify errors or omissions in relevant information or in a statement required by (b) above. Refusal to provide a statement required by (b) above, refusal to provide further relevant information required by the Contracting Officer, or the misrepresentation of any relevant information will result in disqualification of an Offeror from further consideration for award of a contract under this solicitation.

d. Relevant information regarding possible organizational conflicts of interest will not be treated like a separate evaluation factor; however, it will be addressed during the evaluation of proposals. Relevant information regarding each Offeror will be analyzed by the Contracting Officer in accordance with FAR 9.5 in order to determine whether a potential conflict exists and if so, what actions are necessary to avoid or otherwise resolve the potential conflict.

e. The Contracting Officer will use all relevant information submitted by the Offeror, and any other relevant information known to DTRA, to determine whether a potential conflict exists. **If the Contracting Officer determines that a potential conflict exists, the conflict must be avoided or otherwise resolved through the inclusion of a special contract clause or other appropriate means.** Although the terms of any special clause are subject to negotiation, it is likely that the contract will include a clause substantially the same as DTRA Clause 252.209-9000 which is included in Section H of the contract.

L.3.0 VOLUME II – MISSION CAPABILITY

L.3.1 GENERAL

The Mission Capability Volume should describe the Offeror's capability to satisfy the requirements of this solicitation. The proposal should be prepared simply and economically, providing straightforward, concise delineation of the management approach and technical capabilities to satisfactorily perform the contract being sought. Particular proposal strengths or unique approaches should be emphasized. Asserted capability and/or intent to meet the requirements must be supported by detailed descriptions of approach and personnel qualifications. The Government will not assume that an Offeror possesses any capability unless specified in the proposal.

Offeror responses will be evaluated against the Mission Capability subfactors and their related elements defined in Section M, "Evaluation Factors for Award." Using the instructions provided below, provide as specifically as possible the actual methodology that would be used by the Offeror for accomplishing and satisfying these subfactors. All the requirements specified in the solicitation are mandatory. By submitting a proposal, the Offeror is representing that its firm is capable and committed to performing all the requirements specified in the solicitation.

L.3.2 VOLUME ORGANIZATION:

The volume shall be organized according to the following outline:-

- a. Table of Contents
- b. List of Tables and Drawings
- c. Glossary
- d. RFP Cross-Reference Matrix
- e. Section 1, Management Approach
- f. Section 2, Technical Approach

L.3.3 FORMAT AND SPECIFIC CONTENT

Mission Capability shall describe, in narrative form, the Offeror's proposed approach to meeting the requirements of each Mission Capability sub-factor and their related elements, as well as their intended strategy for fulfilling the requirements of the contract. The Offeror shall include the mission capabilities of their team members and other intended subcontractors. The proposed teaming structure, team member roles and responsibilities, experience working as a team, and anticipated portion (by percentage, type of work, geographical, etc.) of work effort for each team member should be discussed or clearly delineated.

L.3.3.1 RFP Cross-Reference Matrix (RCRM)

The Offeror shall fill out an RCRM indicating where the proposal addresses the solicitation requirements. An example format is shown below. The purpose of the RCRM is to show critical interrelationships and dependencies among the documents. The matrix ensures that all requirements are addressed, requirements do not conflict, and proposal sections are internally consistent. This matrix only applies to Volume II.

Example Format:

<i>SOLICITATION CROSS REFERENCE MATRIX</i>			
<i>Solicitation Section/Paragraph</i>	<i>Proposal Volume/ Section/Paragraph</i>	<i>Solicitation Section/Paragraph</i>	<i>Proposal Volume/ Section/Paragraph</i>

L.3.3.2 SECTION 1: MANAGEMENT APPROACH

The Offeror shall submit its comprehensive Management Plan for managing the contract to be awarded. The Management Plan should discuss how the Offeror will provide for maximum flexibility to innovatively and cost-effectively manage the program schedule, performance, risks, warranties, subcontracts, and data to support the program objectives.

The Management Plan should provide the processes and techniques that demonstrate the Offeror's ability to act as a master integrator with the capability to:

- Identify and resolve implementation risk

- Exhibit workforce recruitment, hiring, and retention
- Leverage resident expertise, teaming arrangements and/or other partnerships to provide the knowledge and expertise to accomplish the tasks identified in the Statement of Work
- Socio-economic commitment and subcontracting goal achievement in accordance with L.2.10
- Effectively and efficiently manage and lead assigned tasks, including all subcontractors
- Identify key personnel to include a Program Manager and Deputy Program Manager responsible for providing cohesive technical and administrative leadership and direction for all necessary administrative requirements for the successful and timely implementation of simultaneous tasks

L.3.3.3 SECTION 2: TECHNICAL APPROACH

The Offeror shall prepare and submit responses to four (4) sample Technical Directives at Attachment 4.

The four sample Technical Directives are indicative of the types of requirements that could be implemented throughout the contract. Within each sample Technical Directive, the Offeror shall provide a technical solution that describes how the Offeror will plan to perform the work, to include their ability to:

- Demonstrate a realistic and logically sequenced schedule that demonstrates an effective understanding of required program activities.
- Demonstrate knowledge and ability to leverage collaborative relationships with foreign government, interagency partners, and stakeholders.
- Develop appropriate requirements to accomplish each sample Technical Directive and any associated revisions utilizing skill mix, labor hours, material, and travel, as applicable.
- Demonstrate knowledge and ability to develop or integrate curricula and safely implement trainings relevant to human and animal disease surveillance, detection, diagnosis, and reporting in field and laboratory environments.

For each Technical Directive, the Offeror shall:

Instructions: Offeror to complete blocks 2, 7, 9, and 13.

1. Contract Number
2. Contractor – Full Company Name
3. Technical Directive Number
4. Technical Directive Title
5. Total Estimated Technical Directive - Hours and Dollars
6. Contracting Officer Representative – Contact details
7. Contractor Point of Contact – Details
8. Description of the Technical Directive – Government Provided
9. Solution:
 - a. Proposed Solution: Contractor's proposed solution (including approach, schedule, and risk analysis) for TD. Not to exceed 2 pages.
 - b. Budget: Contractor enter proposed quantity(ies) for TD completion by using the embedded Excel workbook.
 - c. Technical Directive Solution Basis of Estimate – Description: Contractor complete the BOE for proposed solution to TD. Not to exceed 2 pages.
10. Funding Authorized this TD: Identifies information for billing purposes
11. Funds Authorized
 - a. Funds Authorized for this TD Revision Exclusively
 - b. Funds Authorized inclusive of all Revisions, Cumulative Total
12. Period of Performance
 - a. Current
 - b. TD Rev POP

13. Contractor: Sign & Date
14. Region for Technical Directive
15. Contracting Officer Approval: Sign & Date
16. Contracting Officer Representative Approval: Sign & Date

NOTE 1: SAMPLE TECHNICAL DIRECTIVES ARE FOR EVALUATION PURPOSES ONLY AND ARE NOT AWARDABLE.

NOTE 2: RESUMES TO SUPPORT TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS: IT IS EXPECTED DURING CONTRACT EXECUTION THAT THE CONTRACTOR SHALL HAVE DIALOGUE WITH THE TECHNICAL POINTS OF CONTACT TO ADDRESS CLARIFICATION AND QUESTIONS RE: TECHNICAL DIRECTIVES. HOWEVER, DUE TO THE NATURE OF THE SOURCE SELECTION ENVIRONMENT FOR THE SAMPLE TECHNICAL DIRECTIVES, CLARIFICATION DIALOGUE IS NOT ALLOWED. OFFERORS ARE PERMITTED TO PROVIDE RESUMES FOR SUGGESTED LABOR SKILLS TO SUPPORT THEIR PROPOSED TECHNICAL SOLUTION. THE PAGE LIMIT FOR RESUMES TO SUPPORT TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS IS EXCLUSIVE OF THE PAGE LIMIT SET FOR TECHNICAL APPROACH.

NOTE 3: PROPOSED HOURS AND LABOR RATES PER LABOR CATEGORY FOR EACH SAMPLE TECHNICAL DIRECTIVE ARE REQUIRED AND WILL BE TECHNICALLY EVALUATED FOR UNDERSTANDING OF THE REQUIREMENT, HOWEVER LABOR RATES PROPOSED FOR EACH SAMPLE TECHNICAL DIRECTIVE WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED AS PART OF THE COST EVALUATION.

L.4.0 VOLUME III –PAST PERFORMANCE

L.4.1 VOLUME ORGANIZATION

The volume shall be organized according to the following outline:-

- a. Table of Contents
- b. Description of Team
- c. Present and Past Performance References
- d. Organizational Structure Change History

L.4.2 DESCRIPTION OF TEAM

The Offeror shall provide a matrix with no more than the five most critical proposed teaming partners/intended subcontractors and the specific areas within the SOW for which they will be utilized. Offerors shall also provide an approximate percentage of effort, based on overall cost, that each team member/intended subcontractor will contribute to the overall effort.

In addition, the Offeror shall submit a consent letter, executed by no more than the five most critical teaming partner/intended subcontractor, and/or joint venture partner, authorizing release of adverse past performance information to the Offeror, so the Offeror can respond to such information. For each identified effort for the five most critical teaming partner/intended subcontractor, the Offeror shall also submit a client authorization letter, authorizing release to the Government of requested information on the teaming partner/intended subcontractor's performance.

L.4.3 PRESENT AND PAST PERFORMANCE REFERENCES

The Offeror shall identify a minimum of three and a maximum of five references for the prime Offeror as well as a minimum of one and maximum of two references for each of the teaming partners/intended subcontractors expected to perform aspects of the effort that the Offeror considers critical to the overall success of the program. The references shall represent recent contracts (within the past five years) that the Offeror considers most relevant in demonstrating the Offeror's ability to perform the proposed effort. For each reference, the Offeror shall provide a narrative describing the effort and the results of the Offeror's performance. This narrative shall include rationale supporting the assertion of relevance and should be supplemented with a completed Present and Past Performance

Information Form L-1. For a description of the characteristics or aspects the Government will consider in determining relevance, see Section M, Paragraph M.2.2, and Factor B: Past Performance.

In addition to the information provided in the Past Performance Volume, the Offeror shall ensure that each reference identified completes a Present and Past Performance Questionnaire (PPPQ) L-2. This questionnaire shall be submitted directly to the government from the reference; questionnaires received from the Offeror will not be considered. However, the responsibility to send out and track the completion of the PPPQs rests solely with the Offeror. Completed PPPQs shall be emailed in PDF format to the Contracting Officer's e-mail address (leslie.f.simpson.civ@mail.mil). The delivery date and time for the completed PPPQs shall be the same as the delivery date and time for receipt of proposals as stated in L.1.1.1.

L.4.4 ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE CHANGE HISTORY

Many companies have acquired, been acquired by, or otherwise merged with other companies, and reorganized their divisions, business groups, subsidiary companies, etc. In many cases, these changes have taken place during the time of performance of relevant present or past efforts or between conclusion of recent past efforts and this source selection. As a result, it is sometimes difficult to determine what past performance is relevant to this acquisition. To facilitate this relevancy determination, include in this proposal volume a "roadmap" describing all such changes in the organization of the Offeror for the past 5 years and also include a "roadmap" for all team members identified in a Teaming Arrangement for their efforts. As part of this explanation, show how these changes impact the relevance of any efforts the Offeror identifies for past performance evaluation and performance confidence assessment. Since the Government intends to consider present and past performance information provided by other sources as well as that provided by the Offeror, these "roadmaps" should be both specifically applicable to the efforts the Offeror identifies and general enough to apply to efforts on which the Government receives information from other sources. These "roadmaps" will not count toward the page limitations of Volume III.

L.5.0 VOLUME IV – COST

L.5.1 GENERAL

The Offeror shall provide a cost proposal for Labor, Program Management Office (PMO), Materials, Travel and Indirect Costs in accordance with Section L.5.4 below. The proposal should be prepared simply and economically, providing straightforward, concise delineation of capabilities to satisfactorily perform the contract being sought. These instructions are to assist the Offeror in submitting data other than certified cost or pricing data that is required to evaluate the reasonableness, ~~realism~~, and completeness of the proposed costs. Compliance with these instructions is mandatory and failure to comply may render the Offeror's proposal ineligible for award. Offers should be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate their reasonableness. The burden of proof of credibility of proposed costs and prices rests with the Offeror.

Data beyond that required by this instruction shall not be submitted unless the Offeror considers it essential to document or support the cost position. All information relating to the proposed cost and price, including the required supporting documentation must be included in the section of the proposal designated as the Cost Volume (Volume IV). Under no circumstances shall this information and documentation be included elsewhere in the proposal.

In accordance with FAR 15.403-1(b) and 15.403-3(a) and as detailed below, data other than certified cost or pricing data is required.

L.5.2 VOLUME ORGANIZATION

The volume shall be organized according to the following outline:

- a. Table of Contents
- b. Glossary
- c. Cost Narrative
- d. Cost or pricing information and supporting data, to include estimating methodology

L.5.3 COST NARRATIVE

L.5.3.1 Assumptions

The Cost Narrative shall identify all assumptions derived by the Offeror relating to estimated cost and shall reference the applicable paragraph and page number in the Mission Capability Volume (Volume II) of the proposal that provides a corresponding discussion of the particular assumption.

L.5.3.2 Inconsistencies

A cost proposal is presumed to represent an Offeror's best effort to respond to the solicitation. Any inconsistency, whether real or apparent, between promised performances and cost, shall be explained in the cost narrative. For example, if the intended use of new and innovative techniques is the basis for an abnormally low estimate, the nature of these techniques and their impact on cost should be explained. Any significant inconsistency, if unexplained, which raises a concern on the fundamental understanding of the nature and scope of the work required may be grounds for rejection of the proposal ~~or grounds for adjusting the probable cost~~. The burden of proof as to cost-credibility rests with the Offeror.

L.5.4 COST OR PRICING INFORMATION AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

In order to submit a detailed cost proposal, the Offeror shall complete Attachment 3. In addition to filling out Attachment 3, Offerors are also required to submit data other than certified cost or pricing data in order for the Government to evaluate the reasonableness, ~~realism~~, and completeness of the proposed costs. If teaming partners and/or subcontractors are part of the Offeror's proposal, teaming partner and subcontractor other than certified cost and pricing data shall also be included.

For Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINs) 0001, 1001, 2001, 3001, and 4001, Labor Rates for each labor category specified in Attachment 2 shall be blended and shall include all cost elements as specified in FAR 52.232-7(a)(4). For the purposes of this solicitation, blended means, rates for each category of labor to be performed by the Offeror, including labor transferred between divisions, subsidiaries, or affiliates of the Offeror under a common control, and all subcontractors. The proposed labor rates shall be fixed for each period of performance. The total proposed labor costs (labor rates multiplied by assumed hours and totaled) will be incorporated into any resultant contract, as a binding, not-to-exceed ceiling for each labor CLIN. These CLINs are Time and Materials (T&M).

For CLINs 0002, 1002, 2002, 3002, and 4002, the Offeror shall propose all costs associated with Program Management Office (PMO) for the management and administration of the contract. These costs shall include, but not be limited to, a Program Manager and a Deputy Program Manager responsible for providing cohesive technical and administrative leadership and direction for all necessary administrative requirements for the successful and timely implementation of simultaneous tasks for each period of performance. These CLINs are Firm Fixed Price (FFP).

Note: A Project Manager, as described in Attachment 2, is not considered part of PMO.

For CLINs 0003, 1003, 2003, 3003, and 4003, DTRA has provided Material pricing assumptions, which are located in L.5.5 below. The Material pricing assumptions assume all cost elements as specified in FAR 52.232-7(b) with the exception of Travel. Additionally, the following additional cost elements are also included in the Material pricing assumptions that are not specifically mentioned in FAR 52.232-7(b):

- Defense Base Act Insurance
- Taxes (not associated with labor), inclusive of Value Added Taxes (VAT), in countries where no Umbrella Agreement is in place

The Material pricing assumptions will be incorporated into any resultant contract, as a binding, not-to-exceed ceiling for each Material CLIN. These CLINs are T&M.

Note: In accordance with regulations regarding commercial Time and Materials contracts, no fee or profit is allowed on CLINs 0003, 1003, 2003, 3003 and 4003.

For CLINs 0004, 1004, 2004, 3004 and 4004, DTRA has provided Travel pricing assumptions, which are located in L.5.5 below. The Travel pricing assumptions are inclusive of all costs associated with Travel. The Travel pricing assumptions will be incorporated into any resultant contract, as a binding, not-to-exceed ceiling for each Travel CLIN. These CLINs are T&M.

Note: In accordance with regulations regarding commercial Time and Materials contracts, no fee or profit is allowed on CLINs 0004, 1004, 2004, 3004 and 4004.

For CLINs 0005, 1005, 2005, 3005 and 4005, the Offeror shall propose all indirect costs associated with Material and Travel for each period of performance. These CLINs are FFP.

L.5.5. PRICING ASSUMPTIONS

For purposes of preparing a cost proposal, Offerors shall make the following assumptions:

Labor: See Attachment 2, Work Breakdown Structure for a description of each Labor Category. See Attachment 3 for Labor Hour assumptions for each Labor Category within each Labor CLIN.

Material Assumptions:

Material CLIN	Pricing Assumption
0003 – Base Period	\$4,968,678
1003 – Option Period 1	\$3,953,322
2003 – Option Period 2	\$4,032,166
3003 – Option Period 3	\$4,112,809
4003 – Option Period 4	\$3,146,299

Travel Assumptions:

Travel CLIN	Pricing Assumption
0004 – Base Period	\$7,332,967
1004 – Option Period 1	\$6,004,882
2004 – Option Period 2	\$6,124,979
3004 – Option Period 3	\$6,247,479
4004 – Option Period 4	\$4,779,321

End of Section L

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The following have been modified:

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

FAR 52.252-1 Solicitation Provisions Incorporated by Reference FEB 1998

This solicitation incorporates one or more solicitation provisions by reference, with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request, the Contracting Officer will make their full text available. The Offeror is cautioned that the listed provisions may include blocks that must be completed by the Offeror and submitted with its quotation or offer. In lieu of submitting the full text of those provisions, the Offeror may identify the provision by paragraph identifier and provide the appropriate information with its quotation or offer. Also, the full text of a solicitation provision may be accessed electronically at this address: <http://farsite.hill.af.mil>

FAR 52.217-5 Evaluation of Options JUL 1990

M.1.0 EVALUATION PROCESS**M.1.1 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS**

The Government will evaluate fully, carefully and impartially all responsive proposals received in response to this Request for Proposal (RFP) in accordance with the evaluation factors and sub-factors outlined in Section M.2.0.

M.1.2 AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS

The Government intends to award this effort based on the initial proposal, as received, without discussions (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Each Offeror should submit its best proposal as the opportunity to submit a revised proposal is not anticipated.

M.1.3 DISCUSSIONS/COMPETITIVE RANGE

While the Government intends to award without discussions, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer determines them to be necessary. If, during the evaluation period it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, these discussions will be held with only those Offerors determined by the Contracting Officer with approval of the source selection authority to be in the competitive range. The Contracting Officer may determine that the number of most highly rated proposals that might otherwise be included in the competitive range exceeds the number, at which an efficient competition can be conducted and may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals. In addition, the Contracting Officer may also eliminate from the competitive range Offerors originally determined to be in competitive range based on results of written or oral discussions if those Offerors no longer have reasonable chances of being selected for award.

M.1.4 REJECTION OF UNREALISTIC OFFERS

The Government may reject any proposal that is evaluated to be unrealistic in terms of program commitments, including contract terms and conditions, such that the proposal is deemed to reflect an inherent lack of competence or failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the program.

M.1.5 CORRECTION POTENTIAL OF PROPOSALS

The Government will consider throughout the evaluation the "correction potential" of any deficiency or proposal weakness. The judgment of such "correction potential" is within the sole discretion of the Government. If an aspect of an Offeror's proposal does not meet the Government's requirements and is not considered correctable, the Offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range.

M.1.6 PREAWARD SURVEY

The Government may conduct a pre-award survey (PAS) as part of the source selection. Results of the PAS (if conducted) will be evaluated to determine each Offeror's capability to meet the requirements of the solicitation. The Government may also perform a Financial Capability Analysis to verify that the Offeror has the necessary financial resources to perform the effort through the life of the contract.

M.2.0 EVALUATION FACTORS

Three factors will be used in this evaluation:

Factor 1 – Mission Capability

Sub-factor A: Management Approach

Sub-factor B: Technical Approach

Factor 2 – Past Performance

Factor 3 – Cost/Price

M.2.1 FACTOR 1 – MISSION CAPABILITY

The mission capability team will review each Offeror's proposal and assess the strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies of the proposal in relation to the identified sub-factors. The mission capability factor will receive a technical rating. The technical rating reflects the degree to which the proposed approach meets or does not meet the minimum performance or capability requirements through the assessment of strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies and risks of a proposal. The following rating table will be utilized:

COLOR RATING	RATING	DEFINITION
BLUE	OUTSTANDING	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low.
PURPLE	GOOD	Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
GREEN	ACCEPTABLE	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
YELLOW	MARGINAL	Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
RED	UNACCEPTABLE	Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. Proposal is un-awardable.

Sub-factor ratings are not rolled-up into an overall color rating for the mission capability factor. Each sub-factor will individually contribute to the overall assessment of the Offeror's understanding of the complexity and scope of the program and the feasibility of the Offeror's approach to satisfy the government's objective.

M.2.1.1 Sub-factor A – Management Approach

The Government will evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the Offeror's approach to managing the planning and execution of the project throughout the period of performance, and the Offeror's understanding of the technical requirements of STEP.

Evaluation of this subfactor will be based on the Offeror's ability to effectively and successfully manage and lead STEP as demonstrated in Volume II of the proposal.

This sub-factor is met when the Offeror provides a comprehensive management approach that includes an effective organizational structure and management processes with experienced management personnel and describes a thorough, complete, and effective approach to accomplish the overall program and contract objectives as stated in the SOW with an acceptable level of risk. The management approach should illustrate how the Offeror will act as a master integrator with the capability to innovatively and cost-effectively implement requirements awarded under the contract with maximum flexibility.

The following elements will be considered in arriving at a rating but will not be separately rated:

- Risk Identification and Resolution Process
- Workforce recruitment and retention
- Knowledge and expertise through resident, teaming arrangements, and/or partnerships to accomplish the tasks identified in the Statement of Work
- Socio-economic commitment and subcontracting goal achievement in accordance with L.2.10
- Ability to effectively and successfully manage and lead the assigned tasks, including subcontractors.
- Key personnel resumes for Program Manager and Deputy Program Manager to demonstrate ability to provide consistent and cohesive technical and administrative leadership, direction and program management for all necessary administrative requirements for the successful and timely implementation of simultaneous tasks

M.2.1.2 Sub-factor B –Technical Approach

The Government will evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the Offeror's technical capabilities and approach through evaluation of the Offeror's solutions to the sample Technical Directives.

Evaluation of this subfactor will be based on the Offeror's technical capabilities and approach as detailed in Volume II for satisfying the overall program and contract objectives of the SOW.

This sub-factor is met when the Offeror demonstrates the ability to accomplish the following technical elements with an acceptable level of risk.

The following elements will be considered in arriving at a rating but will not be separately rated:

- Realistic and logically sequenced schedule and effective understanding of required program activities.
- Leverage collaborative relationship with foreign government, interagency partners, and stakeholders.
- Appropriate skill mix, labor hours, materials, and travel requirements.
- Appropriate personnel with applicable experience and qualifications
- Development or integration of curricula and safely implement trainings.

M.2.2 FACTOR 2: PAST PERFORMANCE

This factor evaluates the Offeror's relevant present and past work performance history to draw a Performance Confidence Assessment of the Offeror's ability to successfully perform as proposed.

There are two aspects to the past performance evaluation:

The first aspect is to evaluate the Offeror's past performance to determine how relevant a recent effort accomplished by the Offeror is to the effort required by this solicitation. In determining relevance, consideration will be given to projects similar to this solicitation in scope and complexity.

- For scope, each referenced effort will be compared to the requirements of this effort as found in the SOW, Section 2.0, Scope.
- For complexities, each referenced effort will be compared to the requirements of this effort relative to fluid and emergent program requirements, foreign locations, and management of multiple subcontractors.

The Government may consider efforts performed for agencies of the federal, state, or local governments and commercial customers. The evaluation may also include review of efforts performed by other divisions, subcontractors, or teaming contractors, if such resources will be brought to bear or significantly influence the

performance of the proposed effort. For teaming partners/intended subcontractors the relevancy determination will focus on the present and past performance work history as it relates to the specific scope of work the teaming partner/intended subcontractor is proposed to do for this effort. For the prime contractor, the relevancy determination will include comparison to the entire scope of effort for this solicitation regardless of whether the prime or a teaming partner/intended subcontractor is proposed to do the work.

The definitions of relevancy are as follows:

RATING	DEFINITION
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and complexities this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and complexities this solicitation requires.

The second aspect of the past performance evaluation is to determine how well the contractor performed on previous efforts. In making this determination, the Government reserves the right to use both data provided by the Offeror and data obtained from other sources. Where the relevant performance record indicates performance problems, the Government will consider the number and severity of the problems and the appropriateness and effectiveness of any corrective actions taken (not just planned or promised). The Government may review more recent contracts or performance evaluations to ensure corrective actions have been implemented and to evaluate their effectiveness.

To arrive at an overall performance confidence assessment, the evaluation team will consider:

- The combination of the relevancy and performance history of each reference
- The context of present and past efforts (i.e. previous performance as prime contractor or subcontractor) in relation to the Offeror's proposed role on this effort
- The percentage of effort the prime and each teaming partner/intended subcontractor is contributing to the effort
- The "whole picture" the individual references collectively provide

Offerors that do not possess a record of relevant performance or for whom information on present and past performance is not available will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably for Past Performance. Such Offerors will receive a "Neutral" rating to signify an "Unknown" confidence rating for the Past Performance factor. A strong record of relevant performance will be considered more advantageous to the Government than a "Neutral/Unknown Confidence" rating. Relevant performance at the teaming partner/intended subcontractor level also will have a greater impact on the performance confidence assessment than no record of relevant performance. Likewise, more recent and more relevant performance will have a greater impact on the Performance Confidence Assessment than a less recent or less relevant effort. The less relevant a contract is determined to be, the less positive impact the performance associated with that contract will have on the overall performance confidence assessment.

Each Offeror will receive one of the ratings described below:

RATING	DEFINITION
SUBSTANTIAL CONFIDENCE	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.
SATISFACTORY CONFIDENCE	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

LIMITED CONFIDENCE	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.
NO CONFIDENCE	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.
NEUTRAL/UNKNOWN CONFIDENCE	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the Offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.

M.2.6 FACTOR 3 – COST

The Government will not rate or score cost but will evaluate each Offeror's cost proposal for realism, reasonableness and completeness.

~~The Government will evaluate the realism of the proposed cost/price by assessing whether the proposed cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed; reflect a clear understanding of the requirements; and are consistent with the unique methods of performance.~~

The Government will evaluate the reasonableness of the proposed cost/price using one or more of the cost/price analysis techniques defined in FAR 15.404. In evaluating reasonableness, the Government will determine if the Offeror's proposed costs, in nature and amount, do not exceed those which would be incurred by a prudent company in the conduct of competitive business.

The Government will evaluate the completeness of each Offeror's cost proposal by assessing whether the Offeror provides the required cost data in sufficient detail to fully support the offer and permit the Government to evaluate the proposal thoroughly.

~~For evaluation purposes, the Government will determine the most probable cost by adjusting the Offeror's proposed cost, when appropriate, to reflect any additions or reductions in cost elements to realistic levels based on the results of the cost realism analysis. The probable cost may differ from the proposed cost and will reflect the Government's best estimate of the cost of any contract that is most likely to result from the Offeror's proposal. The most probable cost will be used to determine best value to the Government.~~

The total evaluated price will be derived by summing the total proposed CLINs for Labor, PMO, Materials, Travel and Indirect Costs for each Period of Performance.

The evaluated ceiling of each Labor CLIN will be derived by multiplying each proposed labor rate by assumed hours and totaled. The evaluated price for each PMO CLIN will be the proposed FFP cost. The ceiling for each Material and Travel CLIN will equal the given pricing assumptions in L.5.5. The evaluated price for each Indirect Cost CLIN will be the proposed FFP cost.

The total evaluated price shall be based on the information provided in Attachment 3.

M.3.0 BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD

M.3.1 BEST VALUE DECISION

The Government will select the best overall offer based on a comparative assessment of the proposals against all source selection criteria: Mission Capability (separately assessed through two sub-factors), Past Performance, and Cost. This is a best value source selection acquisition conducted in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and Defense FAR Supplement (DFARS). The contract will be awarded to the Offeror who is deemed responsible in accordance with the FAR, whose proposal conforms to the solicitation requirements (including all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by Section L of this solicitation), and is judged, based on the evaluation factors and sub-factors, to represent the best value to the

Government, considering both cost and non-cost factors. This may result in an award to a higher-priced Offeror where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors and the Source Selection Authority (SSA) reasonably determines that the proposal represents the best value to the Government. While the Government source selection evaluation team and the SSA will strive for maximum objectivity, the source selection process, by its nature, is subjective and therefore professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process.

M.3.2 RELATIVE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE

In making the best value decision, the source selection authority will consider the following order of importance:

In compliance with FAR 15.304(d), Factor 1 (Mission Capability) is more important than Factor 2 (Past Performance). Factor 2 is more important than Factor 3 (Cost).

The sub-factors under Factor 1 are listed in descending order of importance. Sub-factor A, Management Approach is more important than Sub-factor B, Technical Approach.

In compliance with FAR 15.304(e), when combined, all other evaluation factors (Factors 1 and 2) are significantly more important than Factor 3. However, Factor 3 (Cost) will be carefully considered in the selection decision.

M.3.3 GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

In addition to the evaluation of the specific factors identified in M.2.0, the Government will consider compliance with the solicitation terms and conditions and the status of contractor and teaming members estimating, purchasing and accounting systems. These general considerations do not receive a color rating, but may be considered by the source selection authority in making the best value decision.

M.3.4 NUMBER OF CONTRACTS TO BE AWARDED

The Government anticipates awarding one contract under full and open competition. The Government reserves the right to award one or no contract.

End of Section M

(End of Summary of Changes)